UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/445,517	12/06/1999	BRADFORD J DUFT	235/013US	1018
44638 7590 10/22/2008 Intellectual Property Department Amylin Pharmaceuticals, Inc. 9360 Towne Centre Drive			EXAMINER	
			DEVI, SARVAMANGALA J N	
San Diego, CA 92121			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1645	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/445,517	DUFT ET AL.	
Examiner-indated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	S. Devi, Ph.D.	1645	
All Participants:	Status of Application:		
(1) <u>S. Devi, Ph.D.</u> .	(3)		
(2) <u>Steven C. Koeber</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: <u>17 October 2008</u>	Time:		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applica Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: Applicants' appeal brief			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed:			
Prior art documents discussed:			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	B DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview	
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)	
`		/	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Mr. Steven Koeber was informed that the appeal brief filed 08/07/08 does not belong to the instant application. It was explained how the number of claims, the type of rejections and claims appendix etc. in the appeal brief do not correspond to the instant application. He assured that he would take corrective actions in response to the Notification of Non-compliant Appeal Brief.

/S. Devi/ S. Devi, Ph.D. Primary Examiner AU 1645

17 October 2008